

TS-EAS - EAC-CPF team

Place: Virtual meeting, Zoom

Date: Friday, 1 February 2019, 11am Melbourne/1pm Berlin/12pm London/7am Boston

Participants:

Ailie Smith
Erica Boudreau
Katherine M. Wisser (Liaison)
Mark Custer (Schema team lead)
Silke Jagodzinski (lead)
Wim van Dongen

Not available: Aaron Rubinstein, Gerhard Müller, Karin Bredenberg, Regine Heberlein,

Minutes

1. Virtual Whiteboard: obsolete
2. EAC-CPF 2010_revised

December - schema update was successful. Not much feedback so far, just people happy to see small things fixed. Kathy thinks this is fine - it was just fixing small issues, not a large change.

Silke closed all the phase 1 issues in Github.

Mark, Karin and Silke will have 3 person meeting on Friday, 22 February 2019 (3pm Berlin/9am Boston) about how to handle Github in the future for EAC - others are free to join as well:

- establishing protocol for creating releases for EAC, how to follow example of EAD3
- Schematrons - are they part of the packages - what documents are part of the release?
- Best practices for revising Tag Library - pull requests, what branch to use, etc.

Where to point people - to Github or institutional home website of the standards

- Github seems most up to date. this should be consistent for the standards
- Silke will talk to Gerhard

3. identifiers

Silke created [document](#) summarizing discussion about identifiers in EAC-CPF. Can we use this document during larger revision process, adding questions or solutions as we have them?

Kathy was confused about merged/translated/aggregated - how those were pulled out:

- when we discussed other record ID - people talked about these three as well as alternative record; we didn't find a solution for how to handle these
- maybe all of them belong to other record ID, we just revise the description of the element
- more generic idea of alternative record (a merged record IS an alternative record). If we are going to separate them, we need a precise definition of alternative record
- distinction between an identifier associated with the record and an identifier associated with the entity being described by the record
- these (merged/translated/aggregated) may need their own attributes

Confusing to have generic "alternative record" while also having specific types of alternative records

- This is [Issue 54](#)
- Wim - we see types of Other ID in practice in Europe
 - Should introduce specific attributes to make this more consistent than use of @localType to specify URL, translated, etc.
- Kathy - Other Record ID was defined narrowly as other EAC-CPF record IDs from other systems
 - Records in other formats (MARC, any other format) is not the job of Other Record ID
 - Identify another place for affiliated, other types of record IDs
- Do we need separate elements, one for other formats and one for authority?
 - Other Record ID - record IDs for one EAC-CPF record in multiple systems
 - Merged, Translated, Aggregated describe this action of a record leaving one system and entering another [is this what was meant?]
- We should be precise about this, as people are doing many different things in practice - nobody is sure
- Articulating actions that could happen to an EAC-CPF record that would result in a change of record ID is first step

Gerhard uses Authority record identifier as Other Record ID; Kathy disagrees, but we need a specific place to put this information.

- Mark - it's fine to use it that way, they are alternative record IDs, they do not describe the entity
- Kathy: Record ID and Other Record ID are linked, describe one EAC-CPF instance
 - Maybe "Other" is too broad
- Cpf-relation for other record formats?

We need a way of acknowledging that multiple records represent the same entity.

- You could have merged, translated, aggregated types of other record IDs for one record
- Can a record itself have relationships that don't indicate a relationship to the entity?
- Merging by aggregating institution vs. merging by original institution, which results in former/obsolete identifiers

As standards committee we should be very clear about elements and attributes and how they should be used

- There is always ambiguity, people have different goals and processes locally, and they deal with the ambiguity by creating local definitions
- Committee needs to then get rid of ambiguity

Be clear about what goes in Control and what doesn't

- Perhaps record IDs for other formats don't belong in Control - only other IDs for this particular EAC-CPF record
- Difference between identifier associated with an individual vs one associated with a record
- Example:

\$aJemison, Mae, \$d1965- \$0

<http://id.loc.gov/authorities/names/n95004729>

\$1<http://id.loc.gov/rwo/agents/n95004729>

- Identity makes sense as a place for this information
- Clearly define the Control section as only describing the record at hand, as EAD does
 - Though there are differences between what the two standards describe, EAD is easier in this way

We are going on to gather examples of how people have handled this issue.

After assembling more examples and use cases, we are going to ask the small EAC-CPF community for feedback and comments on identifier, ask the community to submit examples of how they use Identifiers.

- Mark will get sample from SNAC and Connecting the Dots project, TEI projects,
- Kathy will talk to Harvard and TEI as a standard,
- Wim can provide some from APE,
- Allie will talk to National Archives of Australia,
- Silke will ask Gerhard again for more examples from Calliope

→ Collect these in the identifier [document](#) and review before we meet next.

Goal is to settle on more precise language.

Why do people use TEI instead of EAC-CPF?

- One reason is TEI allows citation for every piece of information, harder in EAC-CPF (cf. [#43](#))
- EAC-CPF records derived from EAD information - would the EAD ID belong in the EAC-CPF record? Is this another use case?

4. Discussion: [#21](#) rule occurrence of elements: omitted
5. Discussion: [#43](#) add assertion description: omitted
6. Status of EAC-EAD comparison

EAD/EAC-CPF comparison group will meet next Tuesday - will have something to report next time.

7. Any other business (all)

RiC/EGAD - shutdown affected this too, no progress. Plan was to release 2nd draft end of Feb, or end of 1st quarter, this is not looking likely.

Feedback form on SAA website for EAC-CPF - who gets this feedback? Is there any? Silke is going to ask Kathy and Cory Nimer or starts a request via this form.

8. Next meeting

Friday, **1 March 2019**, 11pm Melbourne/1pm Berlin/12pm London/7am Boston